
Idaho

ESEA Flexibility

Accountability Addendum



U.S. Department of Education

Washington, DC 20202

June 11, 2014

In order to move forward with State and local reforms designed to improve academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction for all students in a manner that was not originally contemplated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), a State educational agency (SEA) may request flexibility, on its own behalf and on behalf of its local educational agencies (LEAs), through waivers of certain provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements (ESEA flexibility). However, an SEA that receives ESEA flexibility must comply with all statutory and regulatory provisions that are not waived. For example, an SEA must calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b), and disaggregate that rate for reporting. Similarly, an SEA must use an “n-size” that ensures, to the maximum extent practicable, that all student subgroups are included in accountability determinations, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 200.7(a)(2)(i)(B). Furthermore, an SEA may continue to use technical measures, such as confidence intervals, to the extent they are relevant to the SEA’s ESEA flexibility request. This accountability addendum replaces a State’s accountability workbook under NCLB and, together, an SEA’s approved ESEA flexibility request and this accountability addendum contain the elements of the State’s system of differentiated recognition, accountability and support.

Contents

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)..... 2

Annual Measurable Achievement Objective 3 (AMAO 3) under Title III 6

Subgroup Accountability..... 7

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts..... 9

State Accountability System Includes All Students..... 13

Assessments..... 19

Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students’ Privacy 20

Other Academic Indicators 22

Graduation Rate..... 22

Participation Rate..... 24

Instructions to the SEA: Please provide the requested information in the “State Response” column in the table below. Please provide the information in sufficient detail to fully explain your response. Also, please indicate whether the information provided is the same as that in your State accountability workbook under NCLB or reflects a change. Note that these instructions, the “change” column, and the “ED Comments” column of the table will be removed in the version of this document that is posted on ED’s website.

Subject and Question	State Response
Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)	
<p>Please attach the State’s AMOs for reading/language arts and mathematics for the all students group and each individual subgroup. If the State has different AMOs for each school or LEA, attach the State-level AMOs and provide a link to a page on the SEA’s web site where the LEA and school level AMOs are available.</p>	<p>The AMO targets for Idaho are outlined in Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request¹ (dated July 23, 2013), Table 24, pages 124-126. The targets are the same for all schools and groups.</p> <p>The AMO targets are:</p>

¹ All references to Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request are based on the document dated July 23, 2013, and approved by the US Department of Education on January 24, 2014.

Subject and Question	State Response										
		2011	Final Goal	Difference from 2011 to 2017	Annual Rate of Change Required	<u>Reading</u> Annual Measurable Objectives					
						2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	All Students	88.6%	94.3%	5.7%	1.0%	89.6%	90.5%	91.5%	92.4%	93.4%	94.3%
	African American	77.7%	88.9%	11.2%	1.9%	79.6%	81.4%	83.3%	85.1%	87.0%	88.9%
	Asian	87.9%	94.0%	6.1%	1.0%	88.9%	89.9%	90.9%	91.9%	92.9%	94.0%
	American Indian	76.8%	88.4%	11.6%	1.9%	78.7%	80.7%	82.6%	84.5%	86.5%	88.4%
	Hispanic	78.1%	89.1%	11.0%	1.8%	79.9%	81.8%	83.6%	85.4%	87.2%	89.1%
	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	87.3%	93.7%	6.4%	1.1%	88.4%	89.4%	90.5%	91.5%	92.6%	93.7%
	White	91.0%	95.5%	4.5%	0.8%	91.8%	92.5%	93.3%	94.0%	94.8%	95.5%
	Limited English Proficiency	50.2%	75.1%	24.9%	4.2%	54.4%	58.5%	62.7%	66.8%	71.0%	75.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83.4%	91.7%	8.3%	1.4%	84.8%	86.2%	87.6%	88.9%	90.3%	91.7%
	Students with Disabilities	48.9%	74.5%	25.6%	4.3%	53.2%	57.4%	61.7%	65.9%	70.2%	74.5%

Subject and Question	State Response										
		2011	Final Goal	Difference from 2011 to 2017	Annual Rate of Change Required	<u>Math</u> Annual Measurable Objectives					
						2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	All Students	80.8%	90.4%	9.6%	1.6%	82.4%	84.0%	85.6%	87.2%	88.8%	90.4%
	African American	63.5%	81.8%	18.3%	3.0%	66.5%	69.6%	72.6%	75.7%	78.7%	81.8%
	Asian	85.3%	92.7%	7.4%	1.2%	86.5%	87.8%	89.0%	90.2%	91.4%	92.7%
	American Indian	64.3%	82.2%	17.9%	3.0%	67.3%	70.3%	73.2%	76.2%	79.2%	82.2%
	Hispanic	67.3%	83.7%	16.4%	2.7%	70.0%	72.8%	75.5%	78.2%	80.9%	83.7%
	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	80.1%	90.1%	10.0%	1.7%	81.8%	83.4%	85.1%	86.7%	88.4%	90.1%
	White	83.9%	92.0%	8.1%	1.3%	85.2%	86.6%	87.9%	89.3%	90.6%	92.0%
	Limited English Proficiency	41.6%	70.8%	29.2%	4.9%	46.5%	51.3%	56.2%	61.1%	65.9%	70.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73.5%	86.8%	13.3%	2.2%	75.7%	77.9%	80.1%	82.3%	84.5%	86.8%
	Students with Disabilities	37.7%	68.9%	31.2%	5.2%	42.9%	48.1%	53.3%	58.5%	63.7%	68.9%

Subject and Question	State Response																																																																																																																																									
	<table><tr><td></td><td colspan="4"><div>2011</div><div>Final Goal</div><div>Difference from 2011 to 2017</div><div>Annual Rate of Change Required</div></td><td colspan="6"><div>Language</div><div>Annual Measurable Objectives</div><table><tr><td>2012</td><td>2013</td><td>2014</td><td>2015</td><td>2016</td><td>2017</td></tr><tr><td>All Students</td><td>75.5%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>12.3%</td><td>2.0%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>79.6%</td><td>81.6%</td><td>83.7%</td><td>85.7%</td><td>87.8%</td></tr><tr><td>African American</td><td>60.3%</td><td>80.2%</td><td>19.9%</td><td>3.3%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>66.9%</td><td>70.2%</td><td>73.5%</td><td>76.8%</td><td>80.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>81.3%</td><td>90.7%</td><td>9.4%</td><td>1.6%</td><td>82.9%</td><td>84.4%</td><td>86.0%</td><td>87.5%</td><td>89.1%</td><td>90.7%</td></tr><tr><td>American Indian</td><td>56.5%</td><td>78.3%</td><td>21.8%</td><td>3.6%</td><td>60.1%</td><td>63.8%</td><td>67.4%</td><td>71.0%</td><td>74.6%</td><td>78.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>58.7%</td><td>79.4%</td><td>20.7%</td><td>3.4%</td><td>62.1%</td><td>65.6%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>72.5%</td><td>75.9%</td><td>79.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td><td>77.3%</td><td>88.7%</td><td>11.4%</td><td>1.9%</td><td>79.2%</td><td>81.1%</td><td>83.0%</td><td>84.9%</td><td>86.8%</td><td>88.7%</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>79.1%</td><td>89.6%</td><td>10.5%</td><td>1.7%</td><td>80.8%</td><td>82.6%</td><td>84.3%</td><td>86.1%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>89.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Limited English Proficiency</td><td>27.1%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>36.5%</td><td>6.1%</td><td>33.2%</td><td>39.3%</td><td>45.3%</td><td>51.4%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>63.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>66.2%</td><td>83.1%</td><td>16.9%</td><td>2.8%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>71.8%</td><td>74.7%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>80.3%</td><td>83.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>29.4%</td><td>64.7%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>5.9%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>41.2%</td><td>47.1%</td><td>52.9%</td><td>58.8%</td><td>64.7%</td></tr></table></td></tr></table>												<div>2011</div> <div>Final Goal</div> <div>Difference from 2011 to 2017</div> <div>Annual Rate of Change Required</div>				<div>Language</div> <div>Annual Measurable Objectives</div> <table><tr><td>2012</td><td>2013</td><td>2014</td><td>2015</td><td>2016</td><td>2017</td></tr><tr><td>All Students</td><td>75.5%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>12.3%</td><td>2.0%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>79.6%</td><td>81.6%</td><td>83.7%</td><td>85.7%</td><td>87.8%</td></tr><tr><td>African American</td><td>60.3%</td><td>80.2%</td><td>19.9%</td><td>3.3%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>66.9%</td><td>70.2%</td><td>73.5%</td><td>76.8%</td><td>80.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>81.3%</td><td>90.7%</td><td>9.4%</td><td>1.6%</td><td>82.9%</td><td>84.4%</td><td>86.0%</td><td>87.5%</td><td>89.1%</td><td>90.7%</td></tr><tr><td>American Indian</td><td>56.5%</td><td>78.3%</td><td>21.8%</td><td>3.6%</td><td>60.1%</td><td>63.8%</td><td>67.4%</td><td>71.0%</td><td>74.6%</td><td>78.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>58.7%</td><td>79.4%</td><td>20.7%</td><td>3.4%</td><td>62.1%</td><td>65.6%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>72.5%</td><td>75.9%</td><td>79.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td><td>77.3%</td><td>88.7%</td><td>11.4%</td><td>1.9%</td><td>79.2%</td><td>81.1%</td><td>83.0%</td><td>84.9%</td><td>86.8%</td><td>88.7%</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>79.1%</td><td>89.6%</td><td>10.5%</td><td>1.7%</td><td>80.8%</td><td>82.6%</td><td>84.3%</td><td>86.1%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>89.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Limited English Proficiency</td><td>27.1%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>36.5%</td><td>6.1%</td><td>33.2%</td><td>39.3%</td><td>45.3%</td><td>51.4%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>63.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>66.2%</td><td>83.1%</td><td>16.9%</td><td>2.8%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>71.8%</td><td>74.7%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>80.3%</td><td>83.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>29.4%</td><td>64.7%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>5.9%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>41.2%</td><td>47.1%</td><td>52.9%</td><td>58.8%</td><td>64.7%</td></tr></table>						2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	All Students	75.5%	87.8%	12.3%	2.0%	77.5%	79.6%	81.6%	83.7%	85.7%	87.8%	African American	60.3%	80.2%	19.9%	3.3%	63.6%	66.9%	70.2%	73.5%	76.8%	80.2%	Asian	81.3%	90.7%	9.4%	1.6%	82.9%	84.4%	86.0%	87.5%	89.1%	90.7%	American Indian	56.5%	78.3%	21.8%	3.6%	60.1%	63.8%	67.4%	71.0%	74.6%	78.3%	Hispanic	58.7%	79.4%	20.7%	3.4%	62.1%	65.6%	69.0%	72.5%	75.9%	79.4%	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	77.3%	88.7%	11.4%	1.9%	79.2%	81.1%	83.0%	84.9%	86.8%	88.7%	White	79.1%	89.6%	10.5%	1.7%	80.8%	82.6%	84.3%	86.1%	87.8%	89.6%	Limited English Proficiency	27.1%	63.6%	36.5%	6.1%	33.2%	39.3%	45.3%	51.4%	57.5%	63.6%	Economically Disadvantaged	66.2%	83.1%	16.9%	2.8%	69.0%	71.8%	74.7%	77.5%	80.3%	83.1%	Students with Disabilities	29.4%	64.7%	35.3%	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%	47.1%	52.9%	58.8%	64.7%
	<div>2011</div> <div>Final Goal</div> <div>Difference from 2011 to 2017</div> <div>Annual Rate of Change Required</div>				<div>Language</div> <div>Annual Measurable Objectives</div> <table><tr><td>2012</td><td>2013</td><td>2014</td><td>2015</td><td>2016</td><td>2017</td></tr><tr><td>All Students</td><td>75.5%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>12.3%</td><td>2.0%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>79.6%</td><td>81.6%</td><td>83.7%</td><td>85.7%</td><td>87.8%</td></tr><tr><td>African American</td><td>60.3%</td><td>80.2%</td><td>19.9%</td><td>3.3%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>66.9%</td><td>70.2%</td><td>73.5%</td><td>76.8%</td><td>80.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian</td><td>81.3%</td><td>90.7%</td><td>9.4%</td><td>1.6%</td><td>82.9%</td><td>84.4%</td><td>86.0%</td><td>87.5%</td><td>89.1%</td><td>90.7%</td></tr><tr><td>American Indian</td><td>56.5%</td><td>78.3%</td><td>21.8%</td><td>3.6%</td><td>60.1%</td><td>63.8%</td><td>67.4%</td><td>71.0%</td><td>74.6%</td><td>78.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>58.7%</td><td>79.4%</td><td>20.7%</td><td>3.4%</td><td>62.1%</td><td>65.6%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>72.5%</td><td>75.9%</td><td>79.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td><td>77.3%</td><td>88.7%</td><td>11.4%</td><td>1.9%</td><td>79.2%</td><td>81.1%</td><td>83.0%</td><td>84.9%</td><td>86.8%</td><td>88.7%</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>79.1%</td><td>89.6%</td><td>10.5%</td><td>1.7%</td><td>80.8%</td><td>82.6%</td><td>84.3%</td><td>86.1%</td><td>87.8%</td><td>89.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Limited English Proficiency</td><td>27.1%</td><td>63.6%</td><td>36.5%</td><td>6.1%</td><td>33.2%</td><td>39.3%</td><td>45.3%</td><td>51.4%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>63.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>66.2%</td><td>83.1%</td><td>16.9%</td><td>2.8%</td><td>69.0%</td><td>71.8%</td><td>74.7%</td><td>77.5%</td><td>80.3%</td><td>83.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>29.4%</td><td>64.7%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>5.9%</td><td>35.3%</td><td>41.2%</td><td>47.1%</td><td>52.9%</td><td>58.8%</td><td>64.7%</td></tr></table>						2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	All Students	75.5%	87.8%	12.3%	2.0%	77.5%	79.6%	81.6%	83.7%	85.7%	87.8%	African American	60.3%	80.2%	19.9%	3.3%	63.6%	66.9%	70.2%	73.5%	76.8%	80.2%	Asian	81.3%	90.7%	9.4%	1.6%	82.9%	84.4%	86.0%	87.5%	89.1%	90.7%	American Indian	56.5%	78.3%	21.8%	3.6%	60.1%	63.8%	67.4%	71.0%	74.6%	78.3%	Hispanic	58.7%	79.4%	20.7%	3.4%	62.1%	65.6%	69.0%	72.5%	75.9%	79.4%	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	77.3%	88.7%	11.4%	1.9%	79.2%	81.1%	83.0%	84.9%	86.8%	88.7%	White	79.1%	89.6%	10.5%	1.7%	80.8%	82.6%	84.3%	86.1%	87.8%	89.6%	Limited English Proficiency	27.1%	63.6%	36.5%	6.1%	33.2%	39.3%	45.3%	51.4%	57.5%	63.6%	Economically Disadvantaged	66.2%	83.1%	16.9%	2.8%	69.0%	71.8%	74.7%	77.5%	80.3%	83.1%	Students with Disabilities	29.4%	64.7%	35.3%	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%	47.1%	52.9%	58.8%	64.7%												
2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017																																																																																																																																					
All Students	75.5%	87.8%	12.3%	2.0%	77.5%	79.6%	81.6%	83.7%	85.7%	87.8%																																																																																																																																
African American	60.3%	80.2%	19.9%	3.3%	63.6%	66.9%	70.2%	73.5%	76.8%	80.2%																																																																																																																																
Asian	81.3%	90.7%	9.4%	1.6%	82.9%	84.4%	86.0%	87.5%	89.1%	90.7%																																																																																																																																
American Indian	56.5%	78.3%	21.8%	3.6%	60.1%	63.8%	67.4%	71.0%	74.6%	78.3%																																																																																																																																
Hispanic	58.7%	79.4%	20.7%	3.4%	62.1%	65.6%	69.0%	72.5%	75.9%	79.4%																																																																																																																																
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	77.3%	88.7%	11.4%	1.9%	79.2%	81.1%	83.0%	84.9%	86.8%	88.7%																																																																																																																																
White	79.1%	89.6%	10.5%	1.7%	80.8%	82.6%	84.3%	86.1%	87.8%	89.6%																																																																																																																																
Limited English Proficiency	27.1%	63.6%	36.5%	6.1%	33.2%	39.3%	45.3%	51.4%	57.5%	63.6%																																																																																																																																
Economically Disadvantaged	66.2%	83.1%	16.9%	2.8%	69.0%	71.8%	74.7%	77.5%	80.3%	83.1%																																																																																																																																
Students with Disabilities	29.4%	64.7%	35.3%	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%	47.1%	52.9%	58.8%	64.7%																																																																																																																																

Annual Measurable Achievement Objective 3 (AMAO 3) under Title III

Please affirm that the State determines whether an LEA that receives funds under Title III of the ESEA meets AMAO 3 (ESEA section 3122(a)(3)(A)(iii)) based on either of the following:

- Whether the subgroup of English Learners has made adequate yearly progress (AYP) under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B); or
- If the State has received a waiver of making AYP determinations, whether the subgroup of English Learners has met or exceeded each of the following:
 - Its AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - 95 percent participation on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.
 - The State's goal or annual targets for graduation rate if the LEA includes one or more high schools.

Idaho assures that it will make AMAO3 determinations for 2012-2013 and future years for all Idaho LEAs. AMAO3 determinations will include whether the subgroup of English Learners has met or exceeded each of the following:

- Idaho AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- 95 percent participation on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- Idaho's annual targets for graduation rate if the LEA includes one or more high schools.

Subgroup Accountability	
<p>What subgroups, including any combined subgroups, as applicable, does the State use for accountability purposes, including measuring performance against AMOs, identifying priority, focus, and reward schools, and differentiating among other Title I schools? If using one or more combined subgroups, the State should identify what students comprise each combined subgroup.</p>	<p>As noted in the Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request , Section 2A on pages 78-80, the following groups are combined to form an “At-Risk Subgroup”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible • Minority Students • Students with Disabilities • Limited English Proficient Students (LEP) <p>Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) Eligible – FRL eligibility will still be used to represent the subgroup of students who live in families which are economically disadvantaged. The State is not making any change to the definition of this subgroup.</p> <p>Racial and Ethnic Equity (Minority Students) – Idaho is not a very racially or ethnically diverse State; approximately 85% of the population is white. However, ISDE is strongly committed to educational equity among racial and ethnic groups. In smaller school districts, the lack of racial and ethnic diversity virtually precludes reporting by race or ethnicity group.</p> <p>This has been an obstacle to equity in the past. Therefore, the State has changed two aspects of its accountability plan to particularly address the issue of masked ethnicity groups. First, the minimum N count for all metrics has been reduced from $N \geq 34$ to $N \geq 25$. Second, minority students are classified into one ethnic equity group. While combining across defined student groups is not a guarantee of attaining large enough numbers for reporting ($N \geq 25$), it increases the probability of highlighting potential disparities. Minority students are defined as all students who are coded in one of the following race categories: American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, and two or more races. While these race and ethnicity categories will be combined for the accountability matrix, they will continue to be reported publicly by each individual classification.</p> <p>Students with Disabilities – The State is not making any change to the definition of this subgroup. It is comprised of students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP) as defined by the eligibility requirements outlined in the Idaho Special Education Manual.</p> <p>Limited English Proficiency (LEP) – Students who are defined as Limited English Proficient are determined as such through Idaho’s ELL placement test and are served through LEP programs within</p>

Subgroup Accountability	
	<p>Idaho districts. Idaho also defines students in the U.S. school system for the first year to be LEP1 students.</p> <p>Other Accountability Elements (At-Risk Subgroup):</p> <p>Idaho uses a combined At-Risk Subgroup to make accountability determinations as part of its Star Rating system. However, <u>Idaho did not set an AMO specifically for the At-Risk Subgroup</u>. Due to the limited sizes of most subgroups in Idaho, Idaho will deploy the following business rules in the subgroup calculations. Idaho will calculate the Growth to Achievement Subgroups by each of the four listed subgroups (LEP, Students with Disabilities, Free and Reduced Lunch eligible students, Minority Students) into one “At-Risk Subgroup” for each school. The majority of Idaho schools do not have subgroups that meet the $N \geq 25$ threshold, so this is how Idaho is ensuring that all students who traditionally have been identified as having gaps in performance, will be accounted for by combining those four groups into one subgroup. Each student, regardless of multiple subgroup designations, shall only be counted once in the total subgroup for purposes of calculating the Growth to Achievement subcategory.</p> <p>The growth will be calculated for that total combined subgroup for each subject area. If a school has less than 25 students in the combined subgroup, even after combining all four of the identified subgroups, the State will use a three year average (once sufficient years of growth data are available). If there is insufficient data for a three year average, no points will be awarded in this category for the school's Star Rating.</p> <p>Reporting AMOs:</p> <p>In addition to the Star Rating system determinations, which uses the combined At-Risk Subgroup, the State will report absolute performance against AMOs for all required ESEA subgroups on the Idaho Report Card. To ensure focused efforts on the correct students, all ESEA subgroup performance, including all ethnicity and races, will continue to be publicly reported in relation to the State's AMOs for groups of $N \geq 25$. This report will be based on all students in the school. Additionally, the Idaho Report Card will publicly report proficiency levels for all ESEA subgroups and by grade level for groups of $N \geq 10$. The State will not report the performance of the At-Risk Subgroup as an AMO category.</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
What is the State's definition of a local educational agency (LEA)?	<p>Idaho utilizes the definition of local educational agency as defined in ESEA which states, a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or for a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools or secondary schools.</p> <p>Idaho further defines LEAs in Idaho Code 33-301:</p> <p>SCHOOL DISTRICTS BODIES CORPORATE. Each school district, now or hereafter established, when validly organized and existing, is declared to be a body corporate and politic, and in its corporate capacity may sue and be sued and may acquire, hold and convey real and personal property necessary to its establishment, extension and existence. It shall have authority to issue negotiable coupon bonds and incur such other debt, in the amounts and manner, as provided by law.</p> <p>Idaho further defines and LEA in Idaho Code 33-353:</p> <p>NATURE AND POWERS. Each school subdistrict created and established as provided in this act shall be a political subdivision of the state of Idaho. The board of trustees entering the order creating and establishing such school subdistrict shall be the governing body of all school subdistricts created by it, and shall possess the power to order, conduct and hold all elections in such school subdistricts for the purpose of incurring debt and issuing bonds and for the purpose of voting school plant facilities reserve fund levies.</p>
What is the State's definition of a public school? Please provide definitions for elementary school, middle school, and secondary school, as applicable.	<p>The LEA is defined as the local school district or a public charter school. Idaho public schools are defined as those elementary and secondary schools established and maintained at public expense, defined in Idaho Code 33-1001, funded through the total basic foundation program/state aid formula described in Idaho Code 33-1002, and governed by the Idaho State Board of Education described in Idaho Code 33-116. Such public schools shall receive an accountability determination.</p> <p>For the purposes of accountability determinations, an elementary school is one that has a grade configuration that may include grades K-4 but does not contain grade 8 or higher. A middle school is a school that does not meet the definition of an elementary school and contains grade 8 but does not contain grade 12. A high school is any school that contains grade 12.</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
How does the State define a small school?	<p>Idaho defines a small school as a school that does not have a total of 25 students in the tested grade levels.</p> <p>Within Idaho's approved ESEA flexibility request, the minimum n-count was changed to 25 and therefore the definition criteria stayed the same for how the rules were applied, but the definition is changed to "schools that do not have a total of 25 students in the tested class levels."</p>
How does the State include small schools in its accountability system?	<p>For those small schools, the Board and the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) will establish an annual accountability rating based on the same performance metrics as for all other schools under its Star Rating system. However, in order to ensure reliable data, schools with less than 25 students in the tested grades will be held accountable using a 3 year average for each category of achievement, growth, and, where appropriate, post-secondary readiness outcomes.</p> <p>Idaho has a very small number of small, rural and remote schools that, even with a 3 year average, may not have sufficient data for a Star Rating. Regardless, Idaho will provide a determination for all schools that do not have a sufficient population for attaining a Star Rating. This will be done by applying the following rules and in the following order.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Idaho will aggregate Reading, Math, and Language scores on the state test (i.e., ISAT) for the all student population. Instead of calculating the minimum n-size based on the number of students, the minimum n-size will be calculated relative to number of testing units, going back as far as needed up to four years, to find $n \geq 25$. For example, if there are ten students with assessment results in each of the three content areas, there are 30 testing units creating $n \geq 25$. Once the testing units are $n \geq 25$, then determination for the school is made based on percentage of passing scores relative to the total number of testing units. This percentage is converted directly into a 100-point index comparable to the Star Rating index (Table 15 of Principle 2 in Idaho's approved ESEA Flexibility Plan). Schools with an index between 67-100 are not identified for improvement; schools with an index equal to or less than 66 points are identified for continuous improvement. 2. For schools with insufficient testing units to reach the $n \geq 25$ described above, Idaho will reduce the minimum n-size to $n \geq 15$ and then perform the same calculation of the percentage of passing scores relative to the number of testing units for a period up to four years in order to achieve $n \geq 15$. The same index will be applied to the percentage: 67-100 – no improvement requirements; 0-66 –

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
	<p>continuous improvement requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For schools with insufficient testing units on state accountability assessments (i.e., ISAT) to reach $n \geq 15$, Idaho will add Spring results from another state assessment, the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI), to attain a minimum number of testing units for a school and drop the minimum n-count to $n \geq 10$ and use up to a four year period. The IRI is a universal screener for reading given in the Fall and Spring. A Spring score of 3 will be considered a passing score for the testing units. The available testing units will be calculated as a percentage of passing scores on either the IRI or ISAT relative to the number of available testing units. The same index will be applied to the percentage: 67-100 – no improvement requirements; 0-66 – continuous improvement requirements. For schools that do meet the criteria for determination using any of the above rules, a committee comprised of three senior level directors in the Idaho Department of Education will meet to identify appropriate available data sources (qualitative and quantitative) and will develop an appropriate determination based on available information and what is known about the school. The committee will represent the Division of ESEA Programs, the Division of the Statewide System of Support, and the Division of Assessment & Accountability. <p>Small rural schools for which the above rules are applied are not eligible for improvement determinations that are more severe, such as Rapid Improvement or Turnaround, due to the alternative rules being applied. Furthermore, Idaho will review this determination process as needed. If it is found that adjustments are needed, Idaho will work with the U.S. Department of Education to revise this determination process.</p>
How does the State define a new school?	A ‘new school’ for purposes of accountability is a wholly new entity receiving accountability determinations for the first time, or a school with a significant student population change of 35% or more as a result of schools being combined or geographic boundaries changing, or a result of successful school restructuring sanctioned by the Office of the State Board of Education.
How does the State include new schools, schools that split or merge grades (e.g., because of overpopulation or court rulings), and schools that otherwise change configuration in its accountability system?	The State includes new schools, schools that split or merge, and schools that otherwise change configuration in the accountability system by first determining the degree to which the school is an entirely new entity or a merged/reconfigured school. If the school is an entirely new entity (with a new NCES number), it enters the accountability system with no historical record. As such, data collection and analysis of accountability results for the school begins upon completion of the first operational school year. Students must take state assessments in the spring of the first year; those results form the basis for annual determinations of progress. For a school that has reconfigured, split, or merged, the state assigns

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
	the annual determination status of the based on whatever original school makes up the largest share of the new school. For example, in the case of a school that splits equally into two schools (with no merger from other schools), the two new schools both maintain the designation of the original school. For a school that is formed through the merger of two schools, the designation of original school that makes up the larger population remains with the new school; meanwhile, if the merger is equally distributed between merging schools, the more severe or advanced school designation remains with the school. These rules are to ensure that the adults in the system continue the work of improvement.
How does the State include schools that have no grades assessed (<i>e.g.</i> , K-2 schools) in its accountability system?	The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (<i>i.e.</i> , K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended the associated feeder school.
<p>How does the State include alternative schools in its accountability system? Consistent with State law, alternative schools include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State schools for deaf and blind, • Juvenile institutions, • Alternative high schools, and • Alternative schools for special education students. <p>If the State includes categories of alternative schools in its accountability system in different ways, please provide a separate explanation for each category of school.</p>	<p>Alternative schools, which are accredited of their own accord, shall receive an accountability determination. Alternative Programs, which are not accredited of their own accord, will be included for accountability determinations under the sponsoring accredited school.</p> <p>ISDE includes alternative schools that meet the state's statutory definition of alternative school and which are funded under the Public Schools Budget in its accountability system. Schools that are not funded under the public schools budget (<i>e.g.</i>, private schools, other state agencies that operate educational programs, such as juvenile corrections or the Idaho school for the Deaf and the Blind, etc.) are not included in the State accountability system because they operate outside of the authority of the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE).</p> <p>Alternative schools are defined by the state as: Alternative secondary programs are those that provide special instructional courses and offer special services to eligible at-risk youth to enable them to earn a high school diploma. Some designated differences must be established between the alternative school programs and the regular secondary school programs. Alternative secondary school programs will include course offerings, teacher/pupil ratios and evidence of teaching strategies that are clearly designed to serve at-risk youth as defined in this section. Alternative high school programs conducted during the regular school year will be located on a separate site from the regular high school facility or be scheduled at a time different from the regular school hours. (IDAPA 08.02.03.110)</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Schools and Districts	
	Alternative schools are included in the Star Rating accountability system according to the same expectations outlined for all other public schools. There are no special rules in place.
How does the State include charter schools, including charter schools that are part of an LEA and charter schools that are their own LEA, in its accountability system?	Charter schools, whether authorized under a traditional LEA or authorized as their own LEA, are treated like any other public school in the state of Idaho for accountability purposes. An accountability determination is made based on the Star Rating system performance framework. In the case of a Charter LEA, the charter school is held accountable for both school and LEA improvement requirements.

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
What are the State's policies and procedures to ensure that all students are included in its assessment and accountability systems?	<p>All Idaho public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an accountability determination using data collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), the statewide longitudinal data system. Students are tracked by their unique student ID across schools and districts to ensure they are counted in the system.</p> <p>The state contractor receives a list of all students enrolled in the schools based on the ISEE uploads (the same data by which schools are funded). This data not only includes all students but all student demographic information on which to make subpopulation determinations.</p> <p>The 95% participation rate is then calculated using the ISEE data as the denominator and the actual students who took the test as the numerator. This is the same process used for the calculation of the other factors in the accountability system: achievement, growth, growth subgroups and post-secondary and career readiness measures.</p>
How does the State define "full academic year"?	A full academic year is defined at the student participation level as: "A student who is enrolled continuously in the LEA from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period."

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
How does the State determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	<p>Using the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), the statewide longitudinal data system, students are tracked by their unique student ID across schools and districts to ensure they are counted in the system. Using a date-of-enrollment calculation for each student, each individual is determined to be continuously enrolled in each entity: the school, the district (LEA) or the state and are counted in the system according to the full academic year definition described above. Additionally, a student is continuously enrolled if s/he has not transferred or dropped-out or been expelled from a public school. Students who are serving suspensions are still considered to be enrolled students. Expulsion policies in Idaho are used at the district level; students expelled at one school do not typically re-enroll at another school within the same district. A student who is enrolled continuously in the LEA from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included when determining if the LEA has achieved AYP. A student who is enrolled continuously in a public school within Idaho from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period, excluding the make up portion of the test window, will be included when determining if the state has achieved AYP.</p> <p>This rule also applies for all other calculations in Idaho's approved ESEA flexibility request including growth, growth subgroups and college and career readiness measures except for graduation rate.</p>
To which accountability indicators does the State apply the definition of full academic year?	All of the accountability indexes use the full academic year definition: Achievement, Growth to Achievement, Growth to Achievement Subgroups and Post-Secondary and Career Readiness measures with the exception of graduation rate which is calculated on a cohort basis using the NCES formula over a four-year period.
What are the procedures the State uses to ensure that mobile students, including students who transfer within an LEA or between LEAs, are included at the appropriate level (school, LEA, and State) of the accountability system?	<p>Using the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), the statewide longitudinal data system, students are tracked by their unique student ID across schools and districts to ensure they are counted in the system. Using a date-of-enrollment calculation for each student, each individual is determined to be continuously enrolled in each entity: the school, the district (LEA), or the state and are counted in the system according to the full academic year definition listed above.</p> <p>More specifically, a student must be enrolled for a full academic year in the school to be included in the Achievement, Growth to Achievement, Growth to Achievement Subgroups and Post-Secondary and Career Readiness Measures (except graduation rates) for the school, the full academic year for the district to be included in those measures for the district and the full academic year for the state to be included in those measure for the state.</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
Does the State include in accountability determinations the proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities on assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards? If so, does the State limit the number of those scores at the LEA and State levels, separately, so that the number of proficient and advanced scores included in the determinations does not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed?	<p>Yes, Idaho includes proficient and advanced scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities on assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards in the accountability determinations.</p> <p>Yes, the state limits the number of scores at the LEA and state level. The percent of students with proficient or advanced scores in the Alternate Assessment will not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed at the LEA and the state levels. If it is projected that an LEA may exceed the 1% cap due to unusual circumstances, the LEA must use the state appeal process for approval.</p> <p>There is not a cap on the number of student who may receive scores based on the Alternate Assessment. However, the percent of students whose scores are counted as proficient for accountability purposes in the Alternate Assessment is capped at one percent.</p>
If the State provides an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards, does the State include in accountability determinations the proficient and advanced scores of students with disabilities who take that assessment? If so, does the State limit the number of those scores at the LEA and State levels, separately, so that the number of proficient and advanced scores included in the determinations does not exceed 2.0 percent of all students in the grades assessed?	Idaho does not provide an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards (or commonly called a 2% assessment).
What is the State process if an LEA or the State exceeds either the 1.0 or 2.0 percent proficiency cap?	As required by IDEA, students are assessed according to the procedures identified by their IEP. Therefore, if a district IEP Team determines a student's disability is severe and the administration of the state general assessment would be inappropriate, the student would be assessed with the alternate assessment, the ISAT-Alt. However, Idaho only permits the overall proportion of students in the LEA which score at proficient or

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
	<p>advanced to be comprised of a maximum of 1% from student scores on the ISAT-Alt. Any scores on the ISAT-Alt above the 1% cap that are proficient or advanced by alternate standards are counted as "not proficient" in the overall LEA calculation.</p> <p>For example, if an LEA has 1000 students; and if 12 students, or 1.2%, takes the ISAT-Alt; and if 11 of the 12 students score proficient or advanced (i.e., 1.1%); scores for only 10 students (i.e., 1%) would count toward the LEA's overall achievement proficiency, while the remaining 2 scores would count as not-proficient. Therefore, if 700 students taking the regular assessment scored proficient or advanced, the overall percentage for the LEA would be 71% (710/1000).</p> <p>However, the Idaho Department of Education may grant an exception to a district, permitting it to exceed the 1.0 percent cap, only if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the district requests an exception, and 2) the state reviews that request and finds it meets one of two exception options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The district is in a community where school, community, or health programs draw large numbers of families of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. B. The district is considered a small district with only a few students. Idaho has defined "small" as REAP (Rural Education Achievement Program) eligible. <p>In the event an LEA files a request for an exception which is subsequently denied by the State or the LEA fails to submit a request for exception within the timelines allowed, the State will require the LEA to select the appropriate number of students with proficient ISAT-Alt scores and record those scores as non-proficient in the overall LEA calculation. In this circumstance, the LEA will first be given the option to choose the specific students to be recorded as non-proficient and report the information to the State. If the LEA fails to choose the required number of students and notify the State, the State will randomly select the required number of students and notify the LEA of its decision.</p>
<p>What are the State's policies and procedures to ensure that students with disabilities and English Learners are provided appropriate accommodations? In addition, please provide a link to a page on the</p>	<p>A condensed version of accommodations policies and procedures for LEP students and Students with Disabilities is located in the Test Coordinator's Guide for Federal and State Assessments, http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/, pp. 44-61.</p> <p>For LEP students, all policy and procedures for accommodations for LEP students can be found in the Idaho LEP Program Manual, http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/lep/guidance_docs.htm, pp. 24-40.</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
SEA's web site where the State's accommodations manuals or test administration manuals may be found.	<p>Students with disabilities would have their testing accommodations listed in their IEP-link below pg. 85 http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/special_edu/docs/manual/Chapter%205%20IEPs.pdf</p> <p>ISAT-Alt Portfolio Manual (at the bottom under documents pg. 15-16 address accommodations and Assistive Technology) http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/ISATalt/</p> <p>Master List of Allowed Accommodations: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/ISAT/testAdmin.htm</p>
Does the State include, for up to two accountability determination cycles, the scores of former students with disabilities in making accountability determinations for the subgroup of students with disabilities? If so, how?	No.
Does the State count recently arrived English Learners as having participated in the State assessments for purposes of meeting the 95 percent participation requirement if they take (a) either an English language proficiency assessment or the State's reading/language arts assessment; and (b) the State's mathematics assessments?	<p>Yes, Idaho counts recently arrived English Learners as having participated in the ISAT for purposes of meeting the 95% participation requirement if they a) take the Idaho English Language Proficiency Assessment (IELA) or the ISAT in reading; and b) they take the ISAT Mathematics.</p> <p>LEP students who are enrolled in their first 12 months of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language arts ISAT but will be required to take the math and science ISAT in grades offered, with accommodations or adaptations as determined by their English Learning Plan (ELP). These students are included in the participation rates but not in the proficiency calculations for their first administration of the ISAT as allowed by federal flexibility.</p>
Does the State exempt a recently arrived English Learner from one administration of the State's reading/language arts assessment?	<p>Yes, Idaho exempts LEP students in their first 12 months of school in the United States from the ISAT in reading/language arts.</p> <p>LEP students who are enrolled in their first 12 months of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language arts ISAT but will be required to take the math, and science in grades offered, ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as determined by their English Learning Plan (ELP). These students are included in the participation rates but not in the proficiency calculations for their first administration of the ISAT as allowed by federal flexibility.</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
Does the State exclude from accountability determinations the scores of recently arrived English Learners on the mathematics assessment, the reading/language arts assessment (if administered to these students), or both, even if these students have been enrolled in the same school or LEA for a full academic year?	<p>Yes. Scores of ELs are included in accountability determinations only if a student has been in the United States for more than 12 months. If that anniversary falls within a school year and prior to the testing window, the scores for those students are included. A student can only be coded as a LEP1 student (first year) one time in the ISEE system.</p> <p>LEP students who are enrolled in their first 12 months of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language arts ISAT, but will be required to take the math and science ISAT in grades offered, with accommodations or adaptations as determined by their English Learning Plan (ELP). These students are included in the participation rates but not in the proficiency calculations for their first administration of the ISAT as allowed by federal flexibility.</p>
Does the State include, for up to two accountability determination cycles, the scores of former English Learners in making accountability determinations for the subgroup of English Learners? If so, how?	Yes. The State of Idaho includes former English Learners for two accountability cycles after being formally exited from the LEP (limited English proficiency) program, but while they still remain under the monitoring process of the LEP program. Such students are coded as LEPX1 (one year after exit) and LEPX2 (two years after exit), and are included in all LEP categories for achievement and growth.
What are the State's criteria for exiting students from the English Learner subgroup?	<p>The State's current criteria for exiting students from an LEP program can be found in the Idaho LEP Program Manual, http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/lep/state_federal.htm It is described below with additional clarification.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the exiting criteria for LEAs in Idaho details that students should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Score at the Early Fluent (4) or Fluent (5) Level and obtain an (EF+) on each domain on the IELA. 2) And one of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Receive an Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) score of at least a 3; b) Receive an Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) score that meets the "Basic" level <p>During the 2013-2014, districts will pilot an additional academic option for exiting. The following</p>

State Accountability System Includes All Students	
	<p>criteria provide LEP students an option in lieu of a standardized assessment to display their knowledge and understanding of core content. Districts will have the opportunity to gather the following documentation to determine if a student meets the academic factor for exiting.</p> <p>Demonstrate access to core content with a student portfolio using work samples from at least two (2) core content areas that demonstrate a Level 4 “Expanding” as defined by WIDA’s Performance Definition rubrics and Can Do Descriptors.</p>

Assessments	
Which assessments, including alternate assessments, is the SEA using for reporting achievement under ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) (<i>i.e.</i> , reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments)?	<p>Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in grades 3-8 and 10 in Mathematics, Language Usage, and Reading; grades 5, 7 and 10 in Science.</p> <p>Idaho Standards Achievement Tests –Alternate (ISAT-Alt) in grades 3-8 and 10 in Mathematics, Language Usage and Reading; grades 5, 7 and 10 in Science.</p>
What additional assessments, if any, does the State include in its accountability system and for what purpose is each assessment included?	<p>Idaho includes scores from the SAT, ACT, ACCUPLACER and COMPASS college placement and entrance exams in the fourth metric of Post-Secondary and College Readiness measure.</p> <p>As stated in Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 82:</p> <p>“The second category is College Entrance and Placement Exams. In addition to the reading and mathematics Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) and Idaho Standards Achievement Tests-Alternate (ISAT-Alt), Idaho will also include in the metric results from the SAT, ACT, ACCUPLACER, and COMPASS. The State Board passed Idaho Administrative Code requiring all students, beginning with the graduating class of 2012-13, to take one of the four listed college entrance/placement exams by the end of their junior year (IDAPA 08.02.03.105.03).</p> <p>Idaho established a benchmark score for each eligible College Entrance and Placement Exam that research has shown has the highest probability that the student will be successful in entry-level courses. For example, the College Board has established that a composite score of 1550 on the SAT indicates an increased probability of success (defined as a freshman average grade of B- or higher) in college. During the summer of 2012, the colleges and universities in Idaho convened to agree upon a set cut score for the</p>

Assessments	
	ACCUPLACER. That score will be used for this measure. The benchmarks for the ACT and COMPASS were set at the national benchmarks determined by ACT research. All four of these benchmarks and subscore benchmarks were adopted by the State Board in June 2012. In addition, based upon the current performance of this higher, more rigorous criteria, the State Board also adopted a three-year point matrix for increased percentage of students achieving these benchmarks.”

Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students’ Privacy	
<p>What is the State’s minimum “n-size” for determining each of the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation rate • Performance against AMOs • Graduation rate • Other (as applicable, please specify use) 	<p>As stated in Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 79: “...the State has changed two aspects of its accountability plan to particularly address the issue of masked ethnicity groups. First, the minimum N count for all metrics has been reduced from $N \geq 34$ to $N \geq 25$. Second, minority students are classified into one ethnic equity group. While combining across defined student groups is not a guarantee of attaining large enough numbers for reporting ($N \geq 25$), it increases the probability of highlighting potential disparities.”</p> <p>This N size is used for participation rates, performance against AMOs, Achievement, Growth to Achievement, Growth to Achievement Subgroups and Post-Secondary and Career Readiness measures including graduation rates.</p>
<p>What is the State’s minimum “n-size” for protecting students’ privacy when reporting?</p>	<p>As stated in Idaho’s ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 80, the minimum N size for reporting is $N \geq 10$: “To ensure focused efforts on the correct students, all ESEA subgroup performance, including all ethnicity and races, will continue to be publicly reported as is currently the practice by Idaho for groups of $N \geq 10$. Therefore, in the Idaho Report Card, schools will have public proficiency and growth reporting for all races and ethnicities, free/reduced lunch eligible, students with disabilities, and Limited English Proficient students. This reporting provides transparency and assists in highlighting the greatest needs. This reporting will also be used in building plans for One-, Two- and Three-Star Schools.”</p>
<p>What confidence intervals, if any, does the State use in its accountability system to ensure the statistical reliability of school classifications, and for which calculations are these confidence intervals applied?</p>	<p>Idaho does not use confidence intervals for any of its accountability system.</p>

Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students' Privacy

Does the State base accountability determinations on multiple years of data? If so, which years, and how, if at all, are the years weighted?

Idaho's Star Rating accountability system has two elements: an annual determination (i.e., a Star Rating) and an improvement status determination based on two years of progress.

The first element, the annual Star Rating, includes two scenarios where multiple years of data are utilized. First, a Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) is a large component of the rating and is based on at least two years and up to four years of scores for an individual student. This data is not weighted, so no methodology for weighting is applied. Prior year data is used to determine student score histories to allow for percentile comparisons only among students with similar score histories. SGP calculations use a minimum of two years of data points (i.e., change in score from 2012 to 2013 with a comparison to like students from 2012). However, when more than one year is available to calculate the baseline of "like performing peers", previous years are used. Specifically, the peer group may be comprised of 1, 2, or 3 years of baseline data on the individual student. SGP calculations for the individual are based on the greatest number of baseline years (up to 3, not less than 1). In this way, between 2 and 4 years of data are used for every student's individual SGP score. SGP is the actual growth that occurs for the individual student between the baseline year(s) of like-performing peers and the current year performance. The Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) is a projection from the baseline period which forecasts three years or to 10th grade, whichever is sooner, to define how much growth is necessary for the student to meet the benchmark of proficiency by that time. SGP (actual growth from baseline to current year) is compared to AGP (projected growth that is needed from baseline to the future target) in order to indicate whether the school is meeting its students' needs.

A second instance in the annual Star Rating in which multiple years of data are used are in the case of small schools that do not meet $n \geq 25$ students in each tested subject, the State will use a three year average in each subject area tested to determine the current year's annual rating.

The second element, the school improvement status determination, is based on a maximum of two consecutive years. Idaho's Star Rating system is on a 5-point scale, 5 being the best and 1 being the worst. Any school that attains a 3 Star rating or less on its annual rating, is required to submit improvement plans. However, if a school performs at the 1 Star level for two consecutive years, it enters Turnaround status and must implement a Turnaround Plan for three years. Turnaround status requirements are roughly equivalent to those required of a Priority School; however, Idaho will not identify additional schools as Priority Schools beyond those specified in the approved ESEA Flexibility Plan. In other words, the interventions will be the same in the two types of schools, but Turnaround schools identified outside of formal Priority status are not eligible for the SIG 1003g program. Additionally, if a school performs at a 2 Star level or less for two consecutive years (i.e., 2 and 2, 1 and

Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students' Privacy

2, or 2 and 1), it enters Rapid Improvement and must implement a Rapid Improvement Plan for three years. The requirements of Rapid Improvement are roughly equivalent to "Focus Status", but such additional schools will not be labeled as new Focus Schools for federal purposes. By implementing interventions in Turnaround and Rapid Improvement schools that coincide to those required of Priority and Focus schools, Idaho is able enact a more coherent system. Essentially, the use of two consecutive years of performance in the lowest Star Rating categories allows the State an ongoing method by which to identify cases in which more severe interventions are needed.

Other Academic Indicators

What are the other academic indicators for elementary and middle schools that the State uses for annual reporting? What are the State's goal and/or annual targets for these indicators?

Idaho uses the ISAT Language assessment as the other academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. **The State's targets are reflected in Idaho's approved ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 121.**

Graduation Rate

What are the State's graduation rate goal and annual graduation rate targets?

Please provide a table with State-level goal and annual targets for all students and by subgroup beginning with the 2012–2013 school year.

If graduation rate annual targets vary by school, provide a link to the page on the SEA's web site where the LEA and school targets are available.

As stated in the **Idaho's approved ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 82**: "... graduation rate, will be calculated using the previously utilized NCES formula. See the formula on page 82.

Idaho's graduation rate goal is 90%. Idaho holds all schools to the graduation rate goal without intermediate targets. As per the agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to implement the cohort-based graduation rate in 2013-14, Idaho will switch to the cohort-based graduation rate and reset the graduation rate goal at that time.

Graduation Rate	
<p>If the State has received a timeline extension and is not using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for accountability determinations, please specify what rate the State is using and when the State will begin using a four-year adjusted cohort rate.</p>	<p>Idaho received a timeline extension for implementation of the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in 2010. As stated in the Idaho's approved ESEA flexibility request, Principle 2A, page 82: "... graduation rate, will be calculated using the NCES formula that is currently used by Idaho. See the formula below.</p> $G = c_{st}^{long} = \frac{g_{st}}{g_{st} + d_{st}^{12} + d_{s(t-1)}^{11} + d_{s(t-2)}^{10} + d_{s(t-3)}^9}$ <p>Where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> G = graduation rate. c_{st}^{long} = four-year completion rate for state s at year t. g_{st} = number of high school completers at year t. d_{st}^{12} = number of grade 12 dropouts at year t. $d_{s(t-1)}^{11}$ = number of grade 11 dropouts at year $t-1$. $d_{s(t-2)}^{10}$ = number of grade 10 dropouts at year $t-2$. $d_{s(t-3)}^9$ = number of grade 9 dropouts at year $t-3$. <p>Idaho will begin using the four-year adjusted cohort rate reporting in July 2014 as per the extension letter received from Assistant Secretary Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana on May 10, 2010. Idaho's graduation rate goal is 90%. Idaho holds all schools to the graduation rate goal without intermediate targets. As per the agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to implement the cohort-based graduation rate in 2013-14, Idaho will switch to the cohort-based graduation rate and reset the graduation rate goal at that time.</p>
<p>What, if any, extended-year graduation rate(s) does the State use? How does the State use its extended-year graduation rate(s) in its accountability system?</p>	<p>Idaho currently does not use an extended-year graduation rate.</p>

Participation Rate	
How does the State calculate participation rates?	<p>Idaho will continue to employ the following participation rules:</p> <p>The ninety-five percent (95%) determination is made by dividing the number of students assessed on the spring ISAT by the number of students reported on the class roster file uploaded into the Idaho System for Education Excellence (ISEE), the K-12 longitudinal data system.</p> <p>1) If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate will be calculated by a three (3) year average of participation.</p> <p>2) Students who are absent for the entire state-approved testing window because of a significant medical emergency are exempt from taking the ISAT if such circumstances prohibit them from participating. For groups of ten (10) or more students, absences for the state assessment may not exceed five percent (5%) of the current enrollment or two (2) students, whichever is greater. Groups of less than ten (10) students will not have a participation determination.”</p> <p>In 2004, Idaho added to Board Rule the provision to use an average of the most recent three years to determine whether an LEA meets or exceeds the 95% requirement. IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness, in section 03(b)1 states: “If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate can be calculated by the most recent two (2) year or the most recent (3) year average of participation.”</p>
How does the State use participation rates within its differentiated accountability system (<i>i.e.</i> , index)?	<p>As stated in Idaho’s approved ESEA flexibility request , Principle 2A, page 86:</p> <p>All schools and districts must have at least a 95% participation rate in the State assessments for all of their students, including all subgroups, or the star rating for the school or district will be dropped to a maximum of a Three-Star rating or by one star. For example, if a school is rated a Five-Star School, but does not meet the 95% participation rate for any overall or subgroup, the school will be dropped to a Three-Star Rating.</p>